After some careful consideration, I've decided that I can't comfortably abide by the 500 maximum word limit. I can't bring myself to believe that anything valuable about a person can be demonstrated in such little space- I would have to write some gimmick. You are certainly welcome to fling this over your shoulder at any time if this is an instant disqualifier (or if informality gets on your nerves), but I would appreciate it if you read up until the end of the first paragraph, pretending that the entire essay is 500 words in length. I suspect that you'll be sufficiently interested in the unorthodox topic to want to finish reading the entire essay.

Tyler Clementi's suicide seemed to be something new to everyone, and I was the only one who remembered a similar death. Clementi's roommate had placed a hidden camera in his room and recorded eighteen-year-old Clementi having sex with another man, and broadcasted the events over the internet. The ridicule which Clementi received as a result of this was presumably what caused him to jump off of the George Washington Bridge on September 22, 2010. I do not mean to say that I was reminded of the several other young homosexuals who had committed suicide earlier in the month: the comparison was more tangible than that. It was the death of 56-year-old Louis Conradt on November 5, 2006. He had fallen prey to a sting operation which was broadcasted on NBC's former television series, To Catch A Predator.

The show originally emerged from the activity of Perverted Justice, a civilian watchdog group. Members of the group posed as boys and girls ranging from 10 to 15 years old and searched online chat rooms for adults who were willing to engage in sexual activity with them. Once they found one, they posted his personal information on their website. They additionally contacted as many people involved in the adult's life as they could, such as employers, to inform them about what he had typed to their decoy. When NBC became involved with Perverted Justice, the adults began to get invited over to a house which was covered with over a dozen hidden cameras. When an adult arrived, the cameras recorded him being confronted by the host of the show, who carried a transcript of the sexually-explicit online conversation with the Perverted Justice decoy. The host read the most embarrassing sentences to the adult and asked several questions about what he was intending to do. When the nervous adult stepped out of the house, he was dramatically arrested by the police. He was subsequently charged with numerous crimes, usually including at least one felony. NBC nationally broadcasted the events for the amusement of its viewers. Louis Conradt was one of the pedophiles who had agreed to meet what he thought was going to be a 13-year-old boy for sexual activity. When Conradt didn't show up at the house which was leased to NBC, police pursued a warrant for his arrest. The To Catch A Predator crew drove to Conradt's house to wait outside along with the police. When all of the legal technicalities were completed the next morning, they broke into his house and encountered Conradt. He reportedly said, "I'm not going to hurt anyone", raised a pistol to his head, and shot himself.

Perhaps this is making you uncomfortable, and some awkward questions might be surfacing in your mind: "Is this doctrinaire madman expressing sympathy for a pedophile?"; "Is this supposed to be a sick kind of bigoted satire against homosexuals?"; "Is someone in the office pulling my leg?". Independent of whatever opinion anyone might have of Louis Conradt, the similarities between his death and Tyler Clementi's seem obvious. Both men felt as if they had been forced into killing themselves owing to the way in which their society treated them in the course of pursuing its voyeuristic entertainment through surveilling their romantic lives. In Clementi's case, there was national sympathy expressed for weeks and the students who were responsible for broadcasting his sexual activity were universally condemned; in Conradt's case, the only criticism which was ever directed toward Perverted Justice, NBC, and the police, only applied to the technical methodology of his arrest. Xavier Von Erck, the founder of Perverted Justice, responded to Conradt's death by effectively saying that he would have preferred if he hadn't died, but the only thing which bothered him about the situation was that they would not be able to press any charges against a dead man.

Why is it that one of these deaths is considered to be tragic, yet the other is dismissed as being nothing other than an inconvenience and has been completely forgotten? If hypothetically only one of these cases can be considered tragic, why is it Tyler's death by default? Momentarily forget about all of the details pertaining to the lives of both of them for a moment, and only focus on the way in which their society responded to their sexuality. While the treatment which Tyler received was unjustified, it

effectively amounted to nothing other than simple ridicule. In comparison, the treatment which pedophiles receive cannot be described by words.

They are perhaps the most universally condemned, vilified, and isolated group of people on the planet. Pedophiles, virulently rejected by their fellow LGBT activists, have literally no one for them other than several effete associations which haven't been active in decades. In contrast, homosexuals have innumerable support groups to help them with anything they might need. While the discrimination which homosexuals receive is primarily directed toward them from other private citizens, the absolute contempt which pedophiles are subjected to is institutionalized by their government. If someone has been identified as an active pedophile, he is automatically imprisoned for prolonged sentences. If the other prisoners discover that someone is a pedophile, he is brutalized beyond belief, with the rest of society nodding in approval. The prospect of this happening is a significant incentive for pedophiles to commit suicide before being imprisoned. One pedophile who was being charged with child molestation expressed possibly the same sentiment which Louis Conradt was feeling by saying, "If it comes down to that, I'll swallow a bottle of pills. I'd rather go on my own than die in prison".

Everyone who is convicted of engaging in pedophilic activity is given a life sentence independent of the actual verdict: if a pedophile is lucky enough to leave prison within their lifetime, after being subjected to mandatory castration in some cases, they must live the rest of their life branded as a violent rapist. They are constantly under the supervision of their government, in some cases through the use of GPS bracelets. Their personal information is widely divulged to their neighbors, as if public castigation against them is encouraged. They can be evicted or denied service by landlords and can be denied employment without any opportunity for legal recourse while any other group could successfully win a civil rights lawsuit. Left itinerant and without meaningful employment, they are additionally subjected to the universal seething rage of everyone around them, and no one has any sympathy for any harrassment, vandalism, death threats, or overt violence which is directed toward them.

Why is this the case? Is it right that pedophiles are the one social group which everyone can agree deserve to be tortured, if not outright killed? Are they truly the demons which everyone sees them as, which lead one judge in sentencing a pederast to saying among shouts of "Shame!":

". . . the crime of which you have been convicted is so bad that one has to put stern restraint upon one's self to prevent one's self from describing, in language which I would rather not use, the sentiments which must rise in the breast of every man of honor who has heard the details of these two horrible trials. That the jury has arrived at a correct verdict in this case I cannot persuade myself to entertain a shadow of a doubt . . .
It is no use for me to address you. People who can do these things must be dead to all sense of shame, and one cannot hope to produce any effect upon them. It is the worst case I have ever tried . . . I shall, under the circumstances, be expected to pass the severest sentence that the law allows. In my judgment it is totally inadequate for a case such as this."

Although the judge was speaking of pederasty, he presumably would have been even more appalled by pedophilia. Both terms are among a vague series of categorizations for adults who are sexually attracted to youths:

Pedophilia is the sexual attraction to prepubescent children.
Hebephilia is the sexual attraction to children in the early stages of puberty; Louis Conradt was technically a hebephile, not a pedophile.
Ephebophilia is the sexual attraction to pubescent adolescents. Pederasty is generally an instance of an ephebophilic relationship between males.

Pedophilia is commonly used as a blanket-term to encompass all of these, and I will be using it to refer to all of these for the sake of simplicity. Recognize that, however devious, perverted, or illegitimate it might be seen as, and despite the derogatory "phile" appended to it, pedophilia is merely a sexual orientation. It's a part of the rainbow, along with homosexuality and heterosexuality. A pedophile could live their entire life without ever coming into contact with a child because the only requirement for being one is having a sexual attraction to children. However, allowing myself even in the slightest to define pedophilia here as including adults who merely have a dormant sexual attraction to children, would be vapidly conciliatory, and would not address the larger issue. For that reason, the definition of a pedophile

which I will be using is an adult who both desires and engages in sexual activity with any person who is considered to be under the legal age of consent; id est, a child.

Before addressing whether or not the treatment of this group of people is right, the nature of persecution itself must be addressed. Regarding the subject of apathy of persecution, there is a quotation by the pastor Martin Niemöller which goes by several forms and is quite popular. An example of it is:

First they came for the communists, and I didn't speak out because I wasn't a communist.
Then they came for the trade unionists, and I didn't speak out because I wasn't a trade unionist.
Then they came for the Jews, and I didn't speak out because I wasn't a Jew.
Then they came for me, and there was no one left to speak out for me.

Everyone feels good about saying such things, but the use of this quote is actually quite counter-productive because it insufficiently addresses the problem of historical perspectives. If you were to look at many of the groups which have been persecuted throughout history, you would find that many people have never actually been explicitly apathetic to the persecution: it's that they were incapable of seeing that the persecutory treatment of some group was wrong. Afterall, Martin Niemöller himself was an anti-communist who was not merely apathetic to the way in which communists were treated by the Nazi Party, but actively supported it, incapable of seeing that it was actually unjustified.

For example, many Christians during the Middle Ages did not somehow know in the backs of their minds that persecuting "blasphemers" was wrong, yet did not care enough to do anything about the issue: they genuinely believed that blasphemy warranted floggings, imprisonments, and murders. The highly-influential theologian Thomas Aquinas illustrated this belief by saying that heretics "by right . . . can be put to death and despoiled of their possessions by the secular [authorities], even if they do not corrupt others, for they are blasphemers against God, because they observe a false faith. Thus they can be justly punished [even] more than those accused of high treason". The harm which the Christian persecutors inflicted was not caused by apathy, but by a barbaric perspective.

Simultaneously, every generation of people believes that they are lucky enough to be living in a society which is the most enlightened of all history. They believe that they have the best perception of the world out of anyone, and that they are not fundamentally fallible. As much as everyone thinks that this is somehow nonapplicable today, this absolutely includes the current generation just as much as prior ones. This is how bigotry actually prevails: when people have genuine certainty, without any willful ignorance nor deliberate malice, that their actions are justified by their somehow optimal perspective. People must understand that they do not think any fundamentally differently from anyone who lived hundreds of years ago; we do not have some sort of metaphysical comprehension of everything which transcends anything prior people were capable of understanding.

Because of this notion of certainty that we have in our perspective, and being aware that people in the past have always had this identical perspective for themselves while still being fundamentally wrong (as best as we can discern), we can assume that we have beliefs which are fundamentally wrong; the only problem is that it's not exactly a simple matter to identify which ones they are. People who use that Martin Niemöller quote should not be asking themselves "What can we do to stop the persecution of X group?", which is highly dependent on their preexisting prejudices, but rather, "Who is X group?". You can ask yourself if the treatment of pedophiles is genuinely nothing other than the correct way to deal with them, or if this is yet another unseen incarnation of communists, trade unionists, and Jews.

Just like all marginalized groups, pedophiles are stereotyped in undesirable ways. In their case, a typical pedophile is portrayed as being a creepy old man in a dirty rain coat who hides in the bushes of a park with a bag of candy. This, however, is no more legitimate of a representation than any other generic stereotype for its associated group. What then, is a typical pedophile like? To Catch A Predator was actually quite successful in demonstrating that there is no such thing as a typical pedophile. The pedophiles who appeared on the show represented every age group, from 19-year-olds to a 68-year-old. They were of every race, major religion, and type of personality. They were employed in a wide variety of fields, which included education, engineering, marketing, medicine, law enforcement, fire control, and law; Louis Conradt was a district attorney for over twenty years. The one similarity between the pedophiles who appeared on the series was that every one of them was male.

This is not because every pedophile is male; female pedophiles rarely look to the internet to meet children because they generally have greater access to them without causing suspicion. It is not too

unusual for females to be in situations where they can undress or bathe children, and it is considered to be culturally acceptable for females to cuddle, kiss, and fondle them. Females comprise 6% of reported child molestation cases, although ths number is lower than the real value owing to the aforementioned reasons in combination with a lower likelihood of being reported.

The age range of the decoys was also fairly representative of what the most pedophiles are attracted to, although skewed toward the ephebophilia range. Pedophiles who are attracted to prepubescent girls have an age preference of 8-10, and pedophiles who are attracted to prepubescent boys have an age preference of 10-13.

Socrates, along with innumerable other greek men, practiced pederasty. The trial from which the earlier judge's excerpt came was for the highly lauded poet and playwright Oscar Wilde.

"He's just like a flower in bloom. He's at that perfect stage in which he is hermaphroditic. That is to say, he is neither all male nor all female not that anybody is of course, everyone is some mixture of those two characteristics but he is at the moment in that wonderful limbo between being a child and being an adolescent that is he is certainly an adolescent at this point, but he still has this soft feminine grace about him.
A 12 or 13 year old boy."

"I would try by saying that it's the freshness of their mind, the nimbess of their bodies, the way in which they move, they act- They're graceful."

"I just want ot be able to walk down 5th avenue and see adults and children mingled together."

Forcing children into relationships with their parents by stripping away their right to employment and property is no different than forcing women to have husbands by stripping away their right to employment and property.

"A child is uninterested in it, and thus is abused by the adult who manipulates the child for sex."
This is what every adult does for the child. Every adult manipulates it. Yet, you only object when it comes to sex. Why?
If a child is not interested, then they have the option to refuse.

"I don't believe it is possible for a child and an adult to have a healthy symbiotic sexual relationship, mostly due to the fact that most children simply aren't interested in sexual contact."
You can say the same about women.

"'And there's the rub. If it is not between equals, how do you prevent coercion?'
Irrelevant. If that's reason to prevent sex between unequals, it's reason to prevent any interaction between unequals.... unless you can demonstrate that sex is different for some important reason."

People assert that prepubescent children are incapable of having children of their own, so they are not to be allowed to have sex.

Their restriction of children's behavior shouts, "Once you are physically capable of having children, you may have slaves of your own."

People who assert that someone can engage in sexual contact only once they are mature.

"Maturity" is someone's ability to conform to others' expectations.

"Children aren't physically capable!"

Define sexual contact. Perhaps I should define and use "sensuous contact" for them, instead, to encompass more activity.

voting- Men were supposed to represent their family.
Women are too capricious!

What does a person need to "get" about sex? What makes it any more spectacularly involved than tying your shoe, eating some ice cream, or watching a really good film? People don't do themselves any favors by placing sex in its own category of importance and significance. People can connect with each other intimately in many different ways, spiritually and intellectually, as well as physically.

Let me hazard a guess what people mean when they say "children don't understand". They mean they don't have the cynical, ugly jaded view of human beings as manipulating quasi-psychotics. The people who say this tend to see a poisoned well everywhere they look, they see ulterior motives beneath the surface of every expression.

Does a child understand that her step-mom buys her candy and takes her to the park in order to curry her favor? Does she understand that she has to go to Sunday school because her parents want her to grow up with the same inculcation they received? Does she comprehend the subtle molding and shaping and

channeling her guardians impose upon her, in order to try to steer her closer to matching their ideals?

No, most children would not. But you don't say "you shouldn't buy sweets for your kids because they don't understand your motives".

No, instead people telescope on sexual expression. By all means, manipulate children as you see fit. Pour your religion into them, fill them up with your phobias and your cowardice and weaknesses. But dammit, if a sexuality enters the picture at any point, buster, you've crossed the line! Most people don't give two squats about manipulating each other, manipulating children especially. Don't try to fool me that they do.

They care about sex because they've had it blemished by their own parents' shame and guilt and feelings of dirtiness. Religions, but not just religions, have told them to turn their nose in disgust at their animal selves, as if they should castrate an entire aspect of their nature. But you can't. The human animal has its desires and always will. That does not mean, however, that it does not come packaged along with human ego, human consciousness, and conscience.

People will manipulate. People will engage in sex. But these two do not necessarily occur at the same time. They do not entail one another.

If someone detests manipulation, then by all means fight it. I feel the same way, and I hate seeing children lied to and cheated.

But I won't for a second let someone make me feel ashamed because they have issues with human sexuality and place it on a black pedestal.

Sex can express beauty, rapture, spiritual awe. It can represent almost nothing but biological imperative. It can mean domination. It can mean insecurity, or acceptance. But I won't presume to know the particulars of any given case, projecting my problems onto another.

I'll summarize with one of my favorite Nietzsche quotes: "The … resolve to find the world ugly and bad has made the world ugly and bad."

For instance, I hated having my grandmother kiss me.

People who deny the legitimacy of sexual orientation being based on age rather than gender believe that gender is a sort of immutable pseudo-metaphysical categorization of humans yet age is not, so it does not constitute a sexuality.

Yet people treat children

People saying, "You can't handle a relationship with an adult?" is no different than saying to a gay male, "You can't handle a relationship with a woman?"

Children cannot legally consent. That is incontestable.

A part of sexual orientation.

(Address the assertion that since some children are harmed, it's best to outlaw it to protect them.)

I would say that in the meantime, if one straddles the fence, and even if one does not, education seems of the most importance. Granted, we live in a time where I can't frankly engage in discussion with a child about sex without fear of repercussion. I can't even form a close friendship with a young friend without raising suspicions. That makes education difficult. Sometime, somewhere, someone has to fight this if it should ever change. That will inescapably cause hurt to someone else, and a rift in the established order and mean. I lament that, and while I don't know if I could bring myself to serve as such a thorny catalyst, I understand the necessity.

(Address the assertion that sex with children doesn't benefit anyone.)

Add Kinsey.

If a Muslim were to say that a female would be harmed if she let anyone see her skin, and he said that I needed evidence to prove otherwise, I would dismiss his claim. She would only be harmed if everyone told her that she was supposed to be harmed by it.

"When we “protect” children, we prevent them from having access to information and experiences. We may justify doing so in order to promote a particular notion of the good life (”have long term relationships, fall in love, have a family, been more successful, have better mental health” in your words).
We lie to them and lock them up for their own good. But really, it’s for our own good – our conception of the good. All your examples are euphemisms for pursuing a particular kind of life that may, in fact, be very immoral by some standards. Mutual sexuality output contracts, reproduction, achieving high social status, and behaving in a predictable manner do not seem to me to be goals so universally honorable that they justify denying 13-18-year-olds control of their own bodies."

Statutory-rape laws encode the outdated and sexist idea that a woman's virginity must be protected for her father's sake and that she herself can never desire on her own, Levine argues.

On a more general level we can look at the undoubted fact that in this society children are the property of their parents; they are placed in the hierarchical family structure which demands that they be non-sexual and denies them the liberty to choose with whom they want to associate. However much a child may suffer persecution from peers and be unloved

by parents, because of this property relationship, a friendship with an adult is frowned upon. Together with the wrath which results from their breaching of property rights, paedophiles also incur wrath because many people consider sex to be basically brutal and exploitative by its very nature and not mutually enjoyable. Some people therefore assume that any paedophile relationship must necessarily consist of an adult sexually exploiting a child. Consequently the law operates on the assumption that the superior power position of the adult has been used to force the sexual relation-ship. The criminal justice system then, according to this argument, is not primarily concerned with the safety of the child at all but with the safety of the family structure and the maintenance of private property.

Another example of children being controlled by parents- Custody cases. If they are asked what they want, the question they're asked is "By whom do you want to be dominated for a significant portion of your life?"

This contradiction between the free-spirit of children and being owned by their parents...

---Murderers don't have to register on a list, but sex offenders do?

The notion of 'protection' by means of taking all decisions out of the hands of the party to be protected, and giving all responsibility to 'authorities' who are presumed to know best, is clearly evident in the SPCC procedure. In this case it is the social worker who is presumed to know best. And the social worker is clearly charged with the task of convincing the child and family 'of the necessity for prosecuting the offender to protect the community'. What if they are not convinced? What if the child was very fond of the adult and knew a damn sight better than any social worker that he was not a danger to the community? What if the parents knew it too? - for parents often do oppose prosecution.

It appears that this 'we know best' attitude is even allowed to influence the judicial proceedings when they are under way, in the SPCC scheme of things: evidently they do not feel they are overreaching themselves by moral blackmail of the accused, in persuading him to plead guilty so as to protect the child. Yet this kind of pressure is just as unfair, in terms of being contrary to the ordinary rules of natural justice, as the Israeli system described above. Incidentally, it should be realized that the person most sensitive to the harm done by police and court proceedings is often none other than the accused. I have known several people who have pleaded guilty when they might have escaped conviction, simply to save

the child from the anguish of it all. One of them got a life sentence for his pains! Can it really be satisfactory to rely on a system which exploits the courage, the moral strength, the sheer goodness of the accused, in order to condemn him?

'What children really need is the option to refuse. The freedom not to engage in sexual activity is as important as any other aspect of sexual freedom. But children are raised in such a way that they cannot refuse adults. Parents have insisted that children accept all forms of affection from relatives and friends - being picked up, fondled, hugged, kissed, pinched, tickled, squeezed - leaving children with little experience in saying no. They also have little experience in trusting their own reactions to people and in resisting the promise of rewards. They are not informed about sexual matters, do not understand their own sexuality or that of others, and thus cannot cope effectively in this area. We keep children ignorant and then worry that they are vulnerable to sexual advances.' [note 18]

Afterall, different jurisdictions across the world seem to bungle all sorts of things, particularly when it comes to the sexuality of children. Each one seems to come to the conclusion that the children in one place are fundamentally different than the children in another, considering that the ages of consent range from 9 to 21; either that, or their decision is arbitrary and meaningless. There have also been such absurdities as instances of boys below the age of consent, claimed to be incapable of comprehending sexuality, simultaneously being held responsible for child payment. (Laws generally have no idea what they're doing, so perhaps the law is just confused.)

Yet, I cannot imagine that the same person who would claim that the ruling is too imprecise to apply to children, would have any opposition to a single law which deals with the legal treatment of pedophiles, as outlined in the fifth and sixth paragraphs, despite how draconian and absolute all of it is.
*` making such a claim would not object to the current enforcement of anti-pedophile and anti-child legislation, despite how draconian it is. However, I will grant that and address further objections to the consent of children even though it seems quite clear that children can consent.

My short response is that children are incapable of consenting merely because the adults around them say that they aren't capable of consenting. However, this understandably would not allay anyone's anxiety by itself, so I will have to go in-depth into this.

against masturbation in infancy are gradually being broken down, mothers still reinforce prohibitions against guilt-free sex play with age-mates, to say nothing of the incest taboo and the prohibition of sex with adults. It is the mothers who must answer for the 'complexes' which are the result, and which give our culture its characteristically guilt-ridden flavour. Father may appear superficially to be the stern law-giver in the family, but mother is the law-giver-in-chief to both girls and boys in the formative early stages and her threatened capacity to withhold love is a far more potent weapon in fashioning what Freud called the 'super ego', or castrating conscience, than any sanction wielded by the father.

The disparity in size and power between parent and child creates a potential for abuse: a mother could not batter a baby as big as herself. But, on the basis that parent-child relationships are generally positive (and, in addition, given that safeguards can be built in, such as according rights to children) we accept that inequality is simply in the nature of the thing. In itself, it is not an aspect on which we would focus our attention in determining whether a particular mother-child relationship was good or bad.

I would like to see paedophilic relationships looked at in a similar light, because I believe that the comparison with the parent-child relationship is in most cases more appropriate than that with adult sexual relationships. Another model, made much of in J.Z. Eglington's Greek Love, is that of teacher-pupil - the mentor relationship. Why should these models, traditionally asexual as they are (in our culture), be appropriate? Essentially because, notwithstanding the sexual element of paedophilia, the affectual structure of a paedophilic relationship, so far as the child is concerned, is more like that between parent and child, or between teacher and pupil, than between lovers. Sometimes the child feels 'love' for the adult, in a romantic sense; more often, in the case of pre-adolescent children, the affection for the adult is not different in kind to that which it would feel for a parent. On the adult's side there may of course be romantic, essentially non-parental feelings, but in any discussion of the impact of the relationship on the child, it makes sense to take as one's model that which best fits the child's perceptions.

"Let’s face it: the modern crusade to “protect” children is really about protecting traditional parental authority and control."

They conflate rape with sex. They can do the same with adult males and females.

At the moment children are trained not to refuse adults anything and to accept all forms of physical affection as being the right of an adult to impose on a child.

We keep children innocent and ignorant and then somewhat hypocritically worry that they will not be able to resist the sexual approaches of pedophiles.

individual children who are capable of consenting, but that the majority are unable to, so there must be, at the very least, an age of consent law to protect them. In either case, the belief is that at least a considerable portion of children are incapable of consenting to sexual activity, and that therefore, any instance of sexuality among children should be outlawed because it might constitute rape. To include both groups, all references to "a child" and "children" will refer to a completely average child rather than an exceptional one.

Personally, I do not understand why sexual activity is considered to be incomprehensible to a child. Perhaps I missed a memo which I was supposed to receive at some point, because I have the same conception of sexuality as I did when I first was exposed to any information pertaining to it at age 11. While my value-judgements of sex have changed, I haven't had a divine transcendence which I was presumably supposed to have pertaining to the conception of it. Additionally, when I was prepubescent, it was my observation that none of my peers would have had any incapacity to consent. I have never understood the mysticism with which this topic is treated. However, I will try to treat this assertion seriously.

Some who argue that children cannot consent to sexual activity claim that they are literally cognitively incapable of the necessary comprehension. This argument is based on the assertion that children's frontal lobes are inadequately developed to conceive of something as allegedly confounding as sex. The state of their frontal lobes is said to be relevant because their capacity to reason is perceived as being considerably affected by it; capacity to reason is a requisite for understanding what sexual activity entails, which is necessary for the establishment of consent to it. From this view, children would be similar to a mentally-impaired adult. An argument against such an adult's ability to consent does not directly pertain to the developmental state of their brain, but instead relies on a doubt as to their capacity to reason. Similarly, a child's ability to consent would also be purely dependent on their capacity to reason rather than the irrelevant developmental stage of their brain.

At the beginning of 2011, the High Court of England and Wales had to determine the criteria applying to a mentally-impaired adult in establishing the legitimacy of consent to sex. It ruled that:

"For capacity to consent to sex to be present the following factors must be understood:
(a) the mechanics of the act
(b) that only adults over the age of 16 should do it (and therefore participants need to be able to distinguish accurately between adults and children)
(c) that both (or all) parties to the act need to consent to it
(d) that there are health risks involved, particularly the acquisition of sexually transmitted and sexually transmissible infections
(e) that sex between a man and a woman may result in the woman becoming pregnant, and
(f) that sex is part of having relationships with people and may have emotional consequences."

The only re

of cognitive development. The court did not need to isolate mentally-handicapped adults into some quasi-metaphysical category separate from typical adults: the ruling applied to both. Momentarily ignoring (b), these appear to be reasonable criteria for the establishment of consent to sexual activity, and I cannot imagine other jurisdictions coming to vastly different conclusions. The ruling states that any mentally-impaired adult who could understand all of this would be elligible for sexual activity. Likewise, it would intuitively apply to children, who are to be seen as being mentally-impaired owing to their undeveloped frontal lobes. Therefore, if a child understood all of this, then they would be free to engage in sexual activity if they so desired. However, the judge threw in (b), a requirement that only adults could legally engage in sexual activity. It is a qualification which I would similarly expect from every jurisdiction.

If a severely mentally-impaired adult may engage in sexual activity simply because they are capable of understanding sex, then why may a child not enjoy the same right? While it might be conceded that children are cognitively capable of understanding sex, it is further argued that for some number of external reasons, they should not be allowed to engage in it. Because the court did not attempt to justify its position, I will have to assume that it was a general reflection of the attitude of the rest of its society, and I will attempt to address those widespread contentions.

While some people may concede that children are cognitively capable of consenting to sex, they claim that children do not have the practical knowledge to do so. If that is the case, then that is an indication that children should be exposed to all of the relevant information pertaining to sexuality rather

Instead of eliminating sexual relationships which have power discrepancies, it seems as if the most prudent solution is to eliminate the notion of power: the idea that it is right for one person to be subject to the caprice of another, and instead allow people to live in the way they desire. If a child wants to have sex with an adult, why can they not?

No one believes that a pretentious "power disparity" argument applies to the legitimacy of sexual relationships between adults, yet it arbitrarily applies to children?

This argument against pedophilic relationships can be applied to females to oppose their premarital sexual relationships. Because males in such a society have more "power", that makes their relationship illegitimate? What is wrong with that? Someone could say to a male that, "The institution of an adult male having sex with an adult female is rife with innummerable centuries of domination and oppression. Females cannot countenance the power dynamics involved in such a relationship, and thus must be prevented from engaging in any until they attain our societal milestone of marriage".
All that you can say to such a person is, "This has nothing to do with specious notions of institutions, power dynamics, and society. This is what we want to do and it only involves us. Nothing else matters."

The real reason you bring this up is because of a patronizing perspective of children as being sub-human.

There is the argument that the "power disparity" in the relationship between an adult and a child renders any sexuality between them to be inherently abusive.

In any event, the pedophile doesn't have any "power" in the relationship. Numerous people will want to kill the pedophile as soon as he is discovered. How can it be said that there is any power involved in pedophilic relationships? In fact, there is a subversion of power- a subversion of the power of society. (Elaborate, I guess.)

Where the literature suggests that negative consequences of a short or long term nature occur as a result of child-adult sexual contacts, it is found that the consequences are generally associated with three common factors. The first relates to a situation where physical force, coercion or psychological pressure is used. The most adverse reactions occur when physical violence is involved, especially when the child attempts to resist but is unsuccessful. The second negative consequence occurs when poor communications exist in the child's family. Sexual matters cannot be discussed openly and the child receives, or anticipates receiving strongly negative reactions to disclosure of sexual activities. The third relates to a situation where there is little sexual knowledge on the part of the child or alternatively where the child has absorbed parental values suggesting that sex is dirty, painful or frightening. But even when the last two conditions exist the effects, the research would suggest, are nowhere near as traumatic as popular folklore would have it. [*10]

The response of the criminal justice system both to the 'victim' and 'offender' in adult-child cases is counter-productive. We have already seen that the older male is treated with contempt by both the police and the courts and little sympathy is shown towards the way he will be treated in prison. Similarly, the young male's treatment bears a remarkable similarity to that received by incest victims. In both paedophilia and incest considerable distress to the boy or girl occurs when parents, relatives or the police themselves discover the relation-ship. Constant and often insensitive questioning adds to this distress and it is not unusual to find that many researchers have noted that far more damage is caused by the confrontations the child has with his parents or the legal authorities than by the act itself.

In the case of paedophiles as opposed to, for example, parents, it is assumed that any disparities and inequities in power between the adult and the child will be exercised by the adult malevolently. In reality, however, many paedophiles are patently well disposed towards their partners and take the role of loving teachers, house parents, or simply close friends. Clarence Osborne often epitomised the benevolence that exists in paedophile relationships because, in many respects, he displaced the interest shown by their parents. In short, it is a myth to assume that paedophiles necessarily use their greater experience and power in a destructive way.

An associated myth concerns the very common view that the child is traumatised and socially and sexually seriously damaged. We have dealt with this point in length in past chapters, but it is worth reiterating that the

evidence simply does not support these assumptions. In the short run the studies suggest that problems with the partners of paedophiles often flow from the reactions of parents and officials, who respond to news of their son's relationships with such horror that it elevates the significance of the event in the child's life. Even in the study showing the worst possible result—Gagnon' s sample of 333 victims — only 5 per cent of the 'victims' had what Gagnon called 'damaged adult lives'. [*1] Even here though 'damaged adult lives 'is a vague term and diverse causes of the damage besides the paedophile relationship could be possible.
As Plummer perceptively points out, one obvious problem with the stereotyping of paedophiles and the consequent myths that arise as a result of these stereotypes is that the myths and stereotypes usually direct us to look only at the behaviour of men. Similar activities when performed by women such as cuddling, caressing, touching and stroking children are socially acceptable. [*5] But for a man to engage in such contacts is inviting the label of paedophile and possibly risking imprisonment. The stereotypes surrounding paedophiles erect a sexist myth — and that myth is that only men have intimate physical relations with children. The myth conveniently ignores the fact that women often engage in similar sexual behaviour and therefore perpetuates two common views. The first is that 'men should not do this but women can' and the second that 'any man who does this is deeply disturbed'. But by perpetuating these myths, we conveniently forget that children have sexual needs and emotional components that are well documented by contemporary psychology. The very barriers that we put between ourselves and paedophiles are in a sense the same barriers that we put between ourselves as parents and our own children. With both groups we prefer to stereotype them ('paedophiles are monsters', 'children are innocent') and in this way avoid realities that we would otherwise be forced to face.
when the study in question has an inbuilt methodological bias towards producing figures which make the proportion of molestations look artificially high.

(It should always be borne in mind, as stated earlier, that these findings, like so many research data, are based on offences which have resulted in a conviction, and are thereby heavily biased towards relationships which gave rise to complaint by the child.)

Not all those involved in the prosecution process are that dogmatic, thank goodness. In a letter to The Times, [note 30] a police surgeon of twenty-

boy by being starved of love at home, by enduring the anger, fearful interrogation, and most of all by submitting to the formal repetition by the doctor of the acts which were causing all the trouble, one can see that the offender was the last one from whom the boy needed protection.

"Children cannot have sex because of STDs or physical damage."

This seems like another ad hoc justification. If STDs did not exist, pedophilia would not be any less opposed.

STDs are so stigmatized because they pertain to sexuality, not because they're diseases.

If STDs are to be perceived as a serious threat, then there is a great incentive to expose children to full information about sexuality as early as possible, not instead defer any relevant information until they're practically adolescents.

Pregnancy and STDs are very simple concepts that can be thoroughly explained in fewer than five minutes.

They should also have access to contraception and protection rather than the current situation where they have nothing.

Paul Gebhard statistics

Regarding physical damage to children, 95% of consensual pedophlic relationships do not involve penetration.
Pedophiles as a group are not psychopathic: they love children and would not want to harm one.
The Pedophile's Guide to Love and Pleasure, which everyone was freaking out over at the end of 2010, represented the general opinion of pedophiles when it explicitly stated that there should be no penetration with prepubescent children.

People need to realize that children are exposed to risks significantly more harmful than STDs.
If people genuinely were concerned about the health of children, they would exhibit it in other ways. They don't seem to care what unhygienic actions they take. They also do not care about nutrition.

"Children can be brainwashed" . . . Yes, that is absolutely true. People of all ages can be brainwashed, but this in particular applies to children. However, I don't think you are applying this observation to its

natural conlusion. You allow other types of brainwashing: ---

A glance at the way in which we think about religion, and the religious education of children, may help to put our own culture's attitudinal response into a useful perspective. At an official level, it is agreed that a child's introduction to religion is extremely important.In Britain it is enshrined in the 1944 Education Act that all children in all schools shall begin the day with an act of worship -- the only element in the curriculum which is insisted upon by statute. This being the case -- religion being considered to be of vital importance -- one might have expected that there would be an equal concern in Government, at least as great as that in relation to sex, that children should not be subjected to 'manipulaton' by ruthless adult salesmen offering every kind of creed; that these people should not be free to exploit the vulnerable minds of children. For if it is true that children are incapable of making judgements about sexual relationships, how much more adept are they likely to be at judging the rival claims of Protestant and Catholic, or Jehovah's Witnesses and the Exclusive Brethren? How can a child, who is so easily persuaded to believe in Father Christmas, be expected to make sense of it? Won't she or he accept, far too uncritically, the highly contestible notion that there is a god? Why not leave the child's mind in a state of unmolested innocence until an age is reached at which intellectually valid judgements can be made?

But no. Even though this is an important issue, adults are free to fill a child's mind with any prejudice or bigotry they like, without any danger of facing a sentence for corrupting a minor, assault on a child's mind, or anything else. Children are seen as fair game for the imposition of any religious belief or value system that the adult, particularly the parents, cares to impose. As Bertrand Russell has remarked, 'One of the few rights remaining to parents in the wage-earning class is that of having their children taught any brand of superstition that may be shared by a large number of parents in the same neighbourhood.'

Why does society tolerate this? Partly, there is a vague feeling that it is better for a child to have some religion than none at all -- not least because most religions emphasize a restrictive sexual 'morality'! But it is instructive to note that very little is made of the dangers of manipulating a child's mind. The dangers are demonstrably far greater than any consequence of manipulating a child towards consensual sexual activity (one need only mention Northern Ireland to remind oneself of how religious bigotry reinforces antagonism between peoples) but, quite irrationally, society cares less about it. Religious manipulation is assumed to be good and is positively encouraged; sexual manipulation (or 'guidance', 'showing how',

etc.) is assumed to be bad and is stamped upon with maximal force. I shall try to show that the latter assumption is misplaced.

Young children above the age of infancy become susceptible to manipulation of a less direct kind, characterized by deception. When children acquire language, they can be told untruths, from the relatively (though not entirely) benign Father Christmas myth, to the pernicious threat of the 'bogeyman', who comes to take away naughty children. Sexual myths usually fall into the pernicious category, alas, so that the whole area of sexuality becomes poisonously invested with mystery and darkness -- and the perpetrators, far from being paedophiles, are usually ordinary parents who, because of their own sexual anxieties and conflicts, are inclined to fob off children with such classics of deception as the idea that babies are brought be the stork.

If the use of deception is a possibility for parents, it is of course a possibility for paedophiles too. A paedophile who concocts a non-sexual 'reason' for he and a small child to strip naked together, say, may succeed in arousing the child's sexual curiosity and excitement. This would quite clearly be manipulation, based on exploiting the ignorance of the child as to the adult's motives. Supposing, by contrast, the paedophile had been scrupulously non-manipulative. Supposing, instead of playing tricks, he had simply, and openly, invited the child to 'play' sexually. Both approaches would require for their success the child's willing involvement and participation at all stages. The fact that in the more manipulative case the participation is induced by sleight of hand is really less important than the fact that the child is relaxed and enjoying the situation. Indeed, the sleight of hand may be an effective means of enabling the situation to occur 'naturally', so far as the child is concerned, without any embarrassment or uncertainty on the adult's part.

If the child is being led, or manipulated, it is at least a benevolent manipulation, in the sense that it leads -- so long as the child is willing -- towards a pleasurable and harmless outcome. Parents constantly engage in benevolent manipulation of this sort, without fear of social condemnation: usually it is called not 'manipulation', but 'encouragement'. Very often, parents will presume to anticipate a child's long-term wishes by ignoring, or manipulating their way around, her or his immediate wishes. For instance, in teaching a child to swim. The child may at first be tearful and apprehensive of going into the water, or beyond a certain depth. By encouraging 'pull' forces, and cajoling 'push' forces, the parent persuades the child to have a go, to not be afraid, to do that which is not at first desired. The parent does this in the full knowledge that eventually the child

will relax, learn to swim, and enjoy the water.

What the sensible parent does not do is to drag his protesting six-year-old screaming towards the edge of the pool and throw him into the deep end. Interestingly enough, were he to do so, and providing the child were not allowed to drown, this would probably not qualify as a criminal offence, although for the child it could be as nasty an experience as rape. It is not an activity in which the intervention of law is thought to be necessary. There is no elaborate questioning of whether in any particular case the child actually consented to be introduced to the water, or was manipulated into consenting. It is presumed that the adult will be benevolently intentioned, and that all will work out well.

I am not suggesting that in sexual activity a child's wishes should be ignored, in the same way that a parent gets round his child's fear of the water. Given that many children in our culture grow up with a deep suspicion and fear of all things sexual, and given that there are deeply held views as to the 'sinfulness' of many sex acts, adults are morally obliged to accept the child's attitude towards sex. A parent does not accept his child's inalienable right to be afraid of water and of swimming. That would be silly. But the paedophile does have to respect the child's fear of sex. It is the child's right to take a negative attitude, whether because she/he is genuinely afraid of sex, or because she/he simply doesn't fancy, or like, the paedophile in question, or for some other reason.

As a boy-lover, I am aware that chatting to a twelve-year-old is a vastly different matter, on average, to doing the same thing with a boy half that age. The potential for manipulation, benevolent or otherwise, by a male adult at any rate, is enormously curtailed. By this age, practically every boy has learnt a great deal. He will be well aware of the prevailing sexual mores. No adult could con him into sexual activity by disguising his own motives. He would know too well what the grown-up was after. He would know that such people are usually looked down upon. He would know that they are described as 'queers' and 'benders', and that to go with them could result in social disgrace.

There are others who use the opportunity afforded by such social integration to consciously and deliberately seek sexual encounters. Over a period, they may succeed in creating an atmosphere in the group in which sexuality generally is seen to be acceptable, in which the prevailing barriers of sexual inhibition and guilt are lowered. In such a context, the 'seduction' of an individual youngster is likely to be facilitated. It is possible to view the whole, long-term process as cunningly calculating, and therefore manipulative in a mischievous way, but only if one believes it proper that

youngsters should feel sexual inhibition and guilt, and that they are being cheated out of these feelings.

As a final exercise in perspective on the theme of manipulation, we may consider the advice given in a recent medical textbook [*5] to those doctors called upon to examine children following a discovered sexual relationship with an adult: 'If the child refuses to be examined, a process of negotiation and bargaining sometimes results in acqui- escence.' (By offering a bag of sweeties, perhaps?) 'Sedation or deferral of the examination to another visit are other alternatives, depending on the circumstanres. Occasionally, none of these alternatives can be utilised successfully, these cases will require admission of the child to the hospital for examination under anaesthesia. [*6]

So much for the consent of the child to an examination! In the same textbook, a contributor describes the paedophile's efforts 'to persuade his victim to co-operate and to acquiesce or consent to the sexual relationship, oftentimes by bribing or rewarding the child with attention, affection, approval, money, gifts, treats, and good times. But he may be dissuaded if the child actively refuses and resists because he does not resort to physical force. His aim is to gain sexual control of the child by developing a willing or consenting sexual relationship.' The desire for a consensual relationship is thus represented as merely a cynical combination of manipulation and bribery by the adult, although it is conceded that 'At some level, he cares for the child and is emotionally involved with him or her.' The point is that when the consent condition is fulfilled, the rules of the game are suddenly changed and consent is no longer of any account: the paedophile simply cannot win.

Society forces children to be dependent on the caprice of their parents. How can you be surprised if another adult offers them independence?

"Despite all of this, what can we do to prevent children from having sex?"

If you want to teach a child to understand that violence is bad, you must expose the child to accurate information about genuine violence instead of distorting children's minds with cartoons of anvils being bounced off of animals' heads. If someone is appaled by the idea of doing something like exposing a child to an autopsy report of someone who was bludgeoned to death, or exposing them to their mourning associates, or X, it is because that person has an artificial cultural notion of "childhood", which harms the child infinitely more than ay degree of truth ever could. Demonstrating the effects of violence is infinitely more persuasive than saying "Violence is bad because I said so" because it has a basis in reason beyond "I'm bigger than you, so what I say is true". Similarly, information about sexuality should be given to children. If you do not want children to have sexual contact, then provide children with the most accurate and most extensive information about sexuality as you can. Instead of witholding information and saying "You'll do what I say because I said so", you can explain why you believe that they should not engage in sex.

However, once they have the proper information, you will necessarily find that your position is not legitimate in the same way that it would be pertaining to an advisal against violence. Sexuality cannot be reasonably argued against because it is not harmful. You should reevaluate why you don't want the child to engage in sexuality. It's probably because of the indoctrination which you received when you were a child, which dogmatically states that sexuality is wrong.

Inevitably, every parent will shout "But what of my parental rights?": their right to "raise" their children in the way they see fit. However, the existence of "parental rights", by definition, can only entail the license to curtail other people's rights: children's. This is no different than a slaveholder being aghast over someone else telling him that he cannot enslave someone: "But what of my rights as a slaveholder?" he asks. It's a weird cultural perversion that enables the belief that parents have a right to control children. A parent cannot logically object to someone else preventing them from controlling their child under a notion of human rights, unless they view their child as being sub-human and thus beyond human rights. The only justification I can imagine for "parental rights" is that someone would say because the child is alive owing to the parent, or because the child is financially dependent on the parent, then the parent gets to control the child until some arbitrary future point. By that logic, if someone were to rescue someone else from death, the rescuer would be able to rightly enlsave the survivor because they would not be alive without them. Similarly, if someone were to help someone else escape from a labor camp, then that person gets to enslave the laborer because they would not be in the current economic situation they're in without them. The correct solution is to stop forcing children to be dependent on their parents, the same way in which slaves should not be forced to be dependent on their owners. Parents do not have a right to parenting, just as slaveholders do not have a right to slaveholding.

In all of this, there is one resounding question: What are we to do? How can children be anything other than property?

Children have continually been the conceptual fall-guy of civil rights groups.
Slaves, "We are not children. We are not any different from X."
Women, "We are not children. We are not any different from men."
It is time that children stop being seen as (children).

Children are the x (stone or something?) of civil rights.

This is a multifaceted revolutionary notion which cannot be realized immediately, so I will only prescribe the actions which are quite simple and can be immediately taken under the current political stuation. I will not include prescriptions to changing social attitudes.

First, children, being subject to laws, should not be disenfranchised from voting. Children currently have absolutely no representation.

The notion itself of children being property of their parents should be eliminated. They should not be viewed any differently from a tenent living with their landlord. They should not be subject to their parents' coercion to opinions, religion, perspective, (x), (x) . . . Most of all, this includes the right to be free from corporal punishment. "Spanking" should not be viewed with more toleration than wife-battery.

Eliminate the cultural notion of "age-appropriate" material and information.

Children should have the opportunity to separate from their parents as early as is possible, in better circumstances than the current situation under which they have to become destitute. This means that children should have a right to employment and a right to contract for land.

Lastly, children should be sexually liberated, with all of their consentual relations decriminalized. They are to be viewed no differently than adults.

[C]hildren should have the right to conduct their sexual lives with no more restrictions than adults . . . [and] must be provided with all information about sex and related matters so that they are in a position to make reasonable choices. . . . A punitive and draconian justice system that directly punishes a paedophile, indirectly scapegoats a boy who has been involved in a sexual relationship with an older man, . . . and does so with an impact that severely damages both. . . . For the reality is that boys have come to men and will continue, for time immemorial, to come to them in order to have their sexual and emotional needs met.

For [Clarence Osborne] has shown us that . . . young people in western countries feel sexually repressed, alienated from adult company, and emotionally bankrupt. . . . Young boys are sexually active from a very early age and will pursue their sexuality whenever they can find an opportunity to do so; young males wish to give and receive affection in ways that we as a community have not clearly understood before; men who have relationships with boys often do so for benevolent reasons. . . . But if we don't heed the lesson that Osborne taught us, then we will continuously reinforce bigotry and prejudice and we do so at the cost of further damaging our children's welfare.

"I could go into an in-depth discussion refuting the notion that child-adult sex is inherently harmful but whether or not it is or isn't is actually irrelevant. A consistent anarchist would realize that they are not morally entitled to make decisions on behalf of other humans. You can strongly disagree with a child having consensual sex with an adult but it remains their decision to make. You don't have a right to make decisions on my behalf even if you really do have better judgement than I do and even if doing so might actually be in my best, long-term interests. Anti-consensual, pedo-sex anarchists are using the basic argument for the very existence of states, 'their

Eliminate the notion that someone can act on behalf of a child without the child's consent.

Yet the current bizarre situation exists that in every state, you can beat a child as much as you want to under the euphemism of "spanking" and few people will mind, yet as soon as you tell a child that you love him, you're instantly shunned by everyone.

What, then, is my solution?

It is more complicated than this, but the simple answer is that there is no artificial construction of an age of consent. All romantic relationships are decriminalized between consenting people. Current laws which protect against genuine abuse, such as battery, already exist: there is no reason to outlaw a relationship owing to an arbitrary label which this society wants to append to people.

tragedy? (The depths of my soul scream) that this is wrong, this is evil, and no excuse exists which can justify this. Meanwhile, this goes completely unseen. All sorts of civil rights groups march up and down the street nearby this cemetery and protest everything imaginable except for this. The pedophile fashions a NAMBLA sign and manages to crawl to the street and begs the LGBT group to let him join. They shove him back into the dirt and shout, "No! You're not one of us. You're scum and you're making us look bad by associating with us!" as they go back to proselytizing about Tyler Clementi. Louis Conradt's corpse is (rotting) in the cemetery along with Clementi's, yet not a single person cares to mention him. Is his death really to be forever ignored because a young boy agreed to meet him for sexual activity? I am unable to see how Oscar Wilde's "love that dare not speak its name", which earned him a sentence of hard labor, could be thought of as so horrible when he declared to the court and the world that it was

". . . such a great affection of an elder for a younger man as there was between David and Jonathan, such as Plato made the very basis of his philosophy, and such as you find in the sonnets of Michelangelo and Shakespeare. It is that deep spiritual affection that is as pure as it is perfect. It dictates and pervades great works of art, like those of Shakespeare and Michelangelo, and those two letters of mine, such as they are. It is in this century misunderstood, so much misunderstood that it may be described as "the love that dare not speak its name," and on that account of it I am placed where I am now. It is beautiful, it is fine, it is the noblest form of affection. There is nothing unnatural about it. It is intellectual, and it repeatedly exists between an older and a younger man, when the older man has intellect, and the younger man has all the joy, hope and glamour of life before him. That it should be so, the world does not understand. The world mocks at it, and sometimes puts one in the pillory for it."

I am not expecting to change anyone's thoughts on pedophilia. That is not the actual purpose of this essay. It is also not meant to be a thorough analysis of pedophilia, although I would have loved to have the opportunity. I deliberately tried to limit this essay to as many a priori assertions as possible for the sake of brevity.

Perhaps contrary to what you might have expected, I have absolutely nothing at all to do with pedophilia. I am not myself one, I have never been touched by one (at least not from what I'm aware of!), and I have never knowingly had any contact with one. Then why would I write about pedophilia out of all subject for a college application essay? I can almost hear you shouting, "Does he have no idea of what's appropriate?" as you crumple this page. Pedophilia is certainly not my idea of a conversation-starter, but as strange as it may sound, this is the most appropriate topic I could select. It is my belief that the best way to understand someone is to understand the way in which they think.

For all of these reasons, I have to conclude that the most noble form of activism would involve the advocation of pedohile's rights and the liberation of children. This is why I'm currently considering becoming a member of the North American Man/Boy Love Association.

Structured, stoic, methodological, thoughtful, calm, and dispassionate.

And I am aware of its obscene length. Being inappropriately thorough is actually a component of my personality.
The most amusing description of me which I've heard is, "You usually sound absurdly calm, as if the world could be ending and you'd just rub you chin and say, 'Interesting'".

I could have written about a more mundane topic, but it would not have illustrated my thought-process as well.
Somewhat amusingly, this also allows me to evaluate the school. If I would have been rejected independent of my essay, then I could have written anything and still get rejected. If, however, I was otherwise elligible, I could use my topic to evaluate the college. Presumably, while each admissions officer varies, they presumably would not have fundamentally different criterion for selection. If one were to be aghast about my topic and could not comprehend why I would write such things, then it would be safe to assume that all of them would also have some level of dismay. If, however, one were to find this to be an intriguing topic, all of them might have had some level of interest. Presumably, the admissions officers would also reflect the overall college considering that the applicants have to go through them to even be there. If they would have been interested by this topic and not aghast, then it's possible that there would be many people at the college which also were x. The most important criterion for me is the type of people which are there, so that I can engage in discussions which pertain to topics such as this. If I could not do that at such a college, then I wouldn't want to be there in the first place.
And in the course of writing this, I realized that it illustrates something else about me quite well. While rhetorical questions asked to the own writer are to be expected, they are highly reflective of my life. All I have ever been able to do is talk to myself (rhetorically, of course). I have been isolated my entire life. At such a college in which x, I would be able to have discussions with others rather than always thinking about things while alone.

Inflation Of Conflict: the 9-21 Age of Consent argument.
Rhetorical question arguments, look over when you're finished.

* Okami, Paul (1991). "Self-reports of 'positive' childhood and adolescent sexual contacts with older persons: an exploratory study," Archives of Sexual Behavior, 20, 437-457.
* Leahy, Terry. (1992). "Positively experienced man/boy sex: the discourse of seduction and the social construction of masculinity," Journal of Sociology, 28(1), 71-88.
* Leahy, Terry (1994). "Taking up a position: discourses of femininity and adolescence in the context of man/girl relationships," Gender & Society, 8(1), 48-72.

None of these are freely available online, and I only recommend the first. Paul Okami is a deeply honest researcher, and all of his work is well-worth reading. "Sociopolitical Biases in the Contemporary Scientific Literature on Adult Human Sexual Behavior with Children and Adolescents" is a fantastic primer on the problems with most "child sexual abuse" research.